

Comment on “Topological Oscillations of the Magnetoconductance in Disordered GaAs Layers”

In a recent Letter, Murzin *et. al.* [1] investigated “instanton effects” in the magneto resistance data taken from samples with heavily Si-doped GaAs layers at low temperatures (T). This topological issue originally arose in the development of a microscopic theory of quantum Hall effect some 20 years ago. [2] The investigations by Murzin *et. al.*, however, do not convey the correct ideas on scaling that have emerged over the years in the general theory of quantum transport. The physical idea that has been overlooked by Murzin *et. al.* is that the *macroscopic* conductances measured at finite T can in general be very different from *ensemble averaged* conductances at $T = 0$ that one normally uses for theoretical purposes. The concept of *conductance fluctuations* implies, for example, that a complete knowledge of the macroscopic conductances at finite T necessarily involves a detailed knowledge of the complete conductance *distributions* at $T = 0$. [3] This is one of the reasons why the explicit results of phenomenological approaches [4] quoted in Ref. [1] generally lack any kind of microscopic justification.

Unlike the expressions derived in Ref. [1], the general scaling behavior of macroscopic quantities is obtained by using well known methods of quantum field theory (method of *characteristics*). [5, 6] Denoting the *ensemble averaged* longitudinal and Hall conductances by σ_0 and σ_H respectively then the *measured* quantities $G_{ij} = G_{xx}, G_{xy}$ at finite T [1] obey the differential equations [7, 8]

$$\left[\beta_\sigma \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma_0} + \beta_H \frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma_H} + (2 + \gamma) z T \frac{\partial}{\partial z T} \right] G_{ij} = 0. \quad (1)$$

Here, the β_σ , β_H and γ are the renormalization group functions associated with σ_0 , σ_H and the singlet interaction amplitude z respectively. Explicit results in the weak coupling regime have been obtained only recently [8]

$$\beta_\sigma = -\frac{2}{\pi} - \frac{b_1}{\sigma_0} - D_0 \sigma_0^2 e^{-2\pi\sigma_0} \cos 2\pi\sigma_H \quad (2)$$

$$\beta_H = -D_0 \sigma_0^2 e^{-2\pi\sigma_0} \sin 2\pi\sigma_H \quad (3)$$

$$\gamma = -\frac{1}{\pi\sigma_0} - \frac{c_2}{\sigma_0^2} - \frac{D_0}{6} \sigma_0 e^{-2\pi\sigma_0} \cos 2\pi\sigma_H \quad (4)$$

where $b_1 \approx 0.66$, $c_2 \approx 0.47$ and $D_0 \approx 13.56$ are numerical constants. In the regime $e^{-2\pi\sigma_0} \ll 1$ we can write [1]

$$G_{xx} \approx g_0 - g_1 \cos 2\pi\sigma_H, \quad G_{xy} \approx \sigma_H - h_1 \sin 2\pi\sigma_H \quad (5)$$

where the functions g_0 , g_1 and h_1 depend on T only

through the scaling variable X

$$g_0 = g_0(X), \quad X = zT\xi^2 M_0, \quad \xi = l_0 \sigma_0^{-\pi^2 b_1/4} e^{\pi\sigma_0/2}. \quad (6)$$

Here, $\xi \gg l_0$ is the correlation length, l_0 a microscopic length and $M_0 = \sigma_0^{-1/2} [1 + \pi(2c_2 - b_1)/(2\sigma_0) + \mathcal{O}(\sigma_0^{-2})]$. [5] On the other hand, we find

$$g_1 = [f_\sigma(g_0) - f_\infty(\sigma_0)] \pi X g'_0, \quad h_1 = f_H(g_0) - f_\infty(\sigma_0) \quad (7)$$

with $f_\infty(\sigma_0) = [(D_0/4)\sigma_0^2 + \mathcal{O}(\sigma_0)]e^{-2\pi\sigma_0}$. In the limit G_{xx} , $g_0 \rightarrow \infty$ one expects that $g_0(X) \rightarrow (1/\pi) \ln X$ [7] but no first principle computation of $f_{\sigma,H}(g_0)$ exists. Experimentally [1] $G_{xx} \approx g_0 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ such that both the convergence of the series in σ_0^{-1} [7] and the occurrence of broad conductance distributions [3] now complicate the problem. These complications are clearly reflected by the fact that the $g_0(X)$ data in the range of experimental T [1] do not truly display the aforementioned asymptotic behavior in X . In summary,

$$G_{xy}(T) \approx \bar{\sigma}_H - [f_H(g_0) - f_H(\bar{g}_0)] \sin 2\pi\bar{\sigma}_H \quad (8)$$

with $\bar{\sigma}_H$, $\bar{g}_0$ denoting the values of G_{xy} , g_0 at a fixed T , say T_0 , is a very general result that is predicted by the theory [8]. The most important feature of the experimental result $f_H(g_0) \approx 7.6e^{-2\pi g_0}$ for $g_0 = 1.4 - 1.9$ [1] is the exponential dependence on g_0 which actually has a much more general significance in quantum field theory over a much larger range in g_0 . [2, 8]

A. M. M. Pruisken¹ and I. S. Burmistrov^{1,2}

¹Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Amsterdam, Valckenierstraat 65, 1018 XE Amsterdam, The Netherlands

²L. D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kosygina street 2, 117940 Moscow, Russia

PACS numbers: 73.43.-f, 73.43.Nq, 73.43.Qt, 73.50.Jt

-
- [1] S. S. Murzin, A. G. M. Jansen, and I. Claus, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 016802 (2004).
 - [2] For review see *The Quantum Hall effect*, edited by R. E. Prange and S. M. Girvin, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987).
 - [3] M. H. Cohen and A. M. M. Pruisken, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 4593 (1994).
 - [4] B. P. Dolan, Nucl. Phys. **B554**, 487 (1999).
 - [5] J. Zinn-Justin, *Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena*, (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1993).
 - [6] see also A. M. M. Pruisken and Z. Wang, Nucl. Phys. B **322**, 721 (1989).
 - [7] M. A. Baranov, I. S. Burmistrov, and A. M. M. Pruisken, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 075317 (2002).
 - [8] A. M. M. Pruisken and I. S. Burmistrov, arXiv:cond-mat/0502488 (unpublished).